

Exhibit A

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
<p>“a software authoring interface configured to simultaneously visually emulate, via one or more profile display windows, a plurality of network characteristics indicative of performance of the mobile device when executing the application ... further configured to simulate a network connection state encountered by the mobile device”</p> <p>(’192 Patent, Claim 1)</p>	<p>With respect to the terms that overlap with the terms in the agreed constructions, those terms should be construed in accordance with the agreed constructions. With respect to the other terms, no construction necessary beyond plain meaning.</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 7,813,910¹ (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 1:24-67, 2:1-3:61, 4:10-12:65, 14:22-37, 15:11-12)</p> <p>Provisional Application No. 60/689,101 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Pages 1-12)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,924,192 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 14:51-15:35)</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p> <p>Macromedia, <i>Flash MX Professional 2004: Macromedia Flash Lite 1.1 Authoring Guidelines</i>, 2004 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 1, 7-23, 47-55, 75-86)</p> <p>Aiken et al., <i>Microsoft Computer Dictionary</i>, Fifth Edition, 2002 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 32-33, 42, 239, 277-279, 489 and terms author, interface, application programming interface, application development environment, application development system, graphical user interface, test, debug, software, and integrated development environment)</p> <p>IEEE, <i>IEEE Standard Computer Dictionary</i>, 1990 (pages 112-113, 185, 211 and terms interface, user interface, software, testing, and debug)</p>

¹ Each of the patents-in-suit incorporates by reference U.S. Patent No. 7,813,910 and Provisional Application No. 60/689,101. See ’192 Patent at 1:12-19; ’678 Patent at 1:8-18; ’864 Patent at 1:7-14; ’811 Patent at 1:7-19; ’579 Patent at 1:7-16. For some terms, the intrinsic evidence cites are to the ’910 Patent and Provisional Application disclosures.

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>Sandeep Chatterjee, <i>Composable System Resources as an Architecture for Networked Systems</i>, 2001 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, 19-30, 34-40, 49-64, 83, 99-108, 145-154, 162-167)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,392,873 to Agrawal et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:24-4:10, 12:5-27, 13:30-14:55)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,251,815 to Sullivan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 3:24-62, 8:40-9:21)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,042,045 to Sullivan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 3:40-4:7)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0043646 to James et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 2-7, ¶¶ 4-11, 23-42, 46, 49-58, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2014/0137071 to Wadhwani et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, ¶¶ 4, 12, 20-22, 28, 38, 61, 66-68, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 9,623,825 to Feldman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 5, 1:17-67, 4:65-5:55, 6:49-67, 9:38-11:11, 11:64-12:40)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,108,533 to Parasuraman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 7:37-67, 9:40-10:28)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2018/0329805 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 2, ¶¶ 14-21, 29-41, 54-55, Claims 1-7), and the prosecution for the related application (including 2018/09/14 rejection, 2018/12/03 amendments, 2019/03/28 rejection, 2019/06/27 amendments, 2019/07/11 rejection, 2019/10/10 amendments, notice of allowance)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0258565 to Ranjan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-5D, ¶¶ 5-25, 36-54, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0318282 to Patel et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, ¶¶ 24, 30-33, 42-46)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,839,376 to Kurani et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-25, 1:30-8:57, 9:47-10:64, 13:1-14:42, 15:1-30:67, 32:10-34:61)</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>U.S. Patent No. 11,055,196 to Purushothaman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:20-46, 2:56-5:5, 7:62-9:13, 15:32-60)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0100262 to Taylor et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1, 3, ¶¶ 40-49, 53, 58-61, Claims 1-6)</p>
<p>“the software authoring interface is configured to enable a user to select from one or more connection simulations for testing how well mobile content performs on the mobile device”</p> <p>(’192 Patent, Claim 2)</p>	<p>With respect to the terms that overlap with the terms in the agreed constructions, those terms should be construed in accordance with the agreed constructions. With respect to the other terms, no construction necessary beyond plain meaning.</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 7,813,910 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 1:24-67, 2:1-3:61, 4:10-12:65, 14:22-37, 15:11-12)</p> <p>Provisional Application No. 60/689,101 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Pages 1-12)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,924,192 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 14:51-15:35)</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p> <p>Macromedia, <i>Flash MX Professional 2004: Macromedia Flash Lite 1.1 Authoring Guidelines</i>, 2004 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 1, 7-23, 47-55, 75-86)</p> <p>Aiken et al., <i>Microsoft Computer Dictionary</i>, Fifth Edition, 2002 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 32-33, 42, 239, 277-279, 489 and terms author, interface, application programming interface, application development environment, application development system, graphical user interface, test, debug, software, and integrated development environment)</p> <p>IEEE, <i>IEEE Standard Computer Dictionary</i>, 1990 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 112-113, 185, 211 and terms interface, user interface, software, testing, and debug)</p> <p>Sandeep Chatterjee, <i>Composable System Resources as an Architecture for Networked Systems</i>, 2001 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, 19-30, 34-40, 49-64, 83, 99-108, 145-154, 162-167)</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>U.S. Patent No. 8,392,873 to Agrawal et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:24-4:10, 12:5-27, 13:30-14:55)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,251,815 to Sullivan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 3:24-62, 8:40-9:21)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,042,045 to Sullivan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 3:40-4:7)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0043646 to James et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 2-7, ¶¶ 4-11, 23-42, 46, 49-58, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2014/0137071 to Wadhwani et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, ¶¶ 4, 12, 20-22, 28, 38, 61, 66-68, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 9,623,825 to Feldman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 5, 1:17-67, 4:65-5:55, 6:49-67, 9:38-11:11, 11:64-12:40)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,108,533 to Parasuraman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 7:37-67, 9:40-10:28)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2018/0329805 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 2, ¶¶ 14-21, 29-41, 54-55, Claims 1-7), and the prosecution for the related application (including 2018/09/14 rejection, 2018/12/03 amendments, 2019/03/28 rejection, 2019/06/27 amendments, 2019/07/11 rejection, 2019/10/10 amendments, notice of allowance)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0258565 to Ranjan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-5D, ¶¶ 5-25, 36-54, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0318282 to Patel et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, ¶¶ 24, 30-33, 42-46)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,839,376 to Kurani et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-25, 1:30-8:57, 9:47-10:64, 13:1-14:42, 15:1-30:67, 32:10-34:61)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 11,055,196 to Purushothaman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:20-46, 2:56-5:5, 7:62-9:13, 15:32-60)</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
<p>“a software testing interface configured to simultaneously visually simulate, via one or more profile display windows, a plurality of operator network characteristics including at least bandwidth availability indicative of performance of the mobile device when executing the application”</p> <p>(’678 Patent, Claim 45)</p>	<p>With respect to the terms that overlap with the terms in the agreed constructions, those terms should be construed in accordance with the agreed constructions. With respect to the other terms, no construction necessary beyond plain meaning.</p>	<p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0100262 to Taylor et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1, 3, ¶¶ 40-49, 53, 58-61, Claims 1-6)</p> <p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 7,813,910 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 1:24-67, 2:1-3:61, 4:10-12:65, 14:22-37, 15:11-12)</p> <p>Provisional Application No. 60/689,101 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Pages 1-12)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,924,192 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 14:51-15:35)</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p> <p>Aiken et al., <i>Microsoft Computer Dictionary</i>, Fifth Edition, 2002 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 32-33, 42, 148, 239, 277-279, 489, 516 and terms author, interface, application programming interface, application development environment, application development system, graphical user interface, test, debug, software, and integrated development environment)</p> <p>IEEE, <i>IEEE Standard Computer Dictionary</i>, 1990 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 63, 112-113, 185, 200, 211 and terms interface, user interface, software, testing, and debug)</p> <p>Sandeep Chatterjee, <i>Composable System Resources as an Architecture for Networked Systems</i>, 2001 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, 19-30, 34-40, 49-64, 83, 99-108, 145-154, 162-167)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 7,526,681 to Anafi et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 1-13, 1:1-5:9, 5:47-6:56, 7:65-12:36)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0043646 to James et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 2-7, ¶¶ 4-11, 23-42, 46, 49-58, Claims 1-20)</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>U.S. Patent No. 11,188,448 to Bandari et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:15-2:18, 3:40-56, 5:3-6:30, 9:49-10:27, 10:46-12:47, 13:23-14:18, 15:29-16:5, 16:44-19:6, 19:13-22:32)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2014/0137071 to Wadhvani et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, ¶¶ 4, 12, 20-22, 28, 38, 61, 66-68, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,108,533 to Parasuraman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 7:37-67, 9:40-10:28)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2018/0329805 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 2, ¶¶ 14-21, 29-41, 54-55, Claims 1-7), and the prosecution for the related application (including 2018/09/14 rejection, 2018/12/03 amendments, 2019/03/28 rejection, 2019/06/27 amendments, 2019/07/11 rejection, 2019/10/10 amendments, notice of allowance)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0258565 to Ranjan et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-5D, ¶¶ 5-25, 36-54, Claims 1-20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2019/0318282 to Patel et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, ¶¶ 24, 30-33, 42-46)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,839,376 to Kurani et al (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1-25, 1:30-8:57, 9:47-10:64, 13:1-14:42, 15:1-30:67, 32:10-34:61)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 11,055,196 to Purushothaman et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:20-46, 2:56-5:5, 7:62-9:13, 15:32-60)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0100262 to Taylor et al. (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Figs. 1, 3, ¶¶ 40-49, 53, 58-61, Claims 1-6)</p>
<p>“network characteristics” (Δ)</p> <p>(’192 Patent, Claim 1)</p> <p>(’864 Patent, Claim 1)</p> <p>(’678 Patent, Claim 45)</p> <p>(’579 Patent, Claims 25, 26)</p>	<p>No construction necessary beyond plain meaning</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>’192 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 16</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 1:23–2:8, 10:15–14:33</p> <p>’864 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 7, 17, 18</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 21–26, 1:18–2:7, 9:60–14:13</p> <p>’678 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 16, 26, 37, 39, 41, 45</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 1:22–2:9, 10:34–14:62</p> <p>’579 Patent:</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>Claims 25, 26</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 21–26, 1:20–2:11, 10:12–14:39</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p>
<p>“indicative of” (Δ)</p> <p>(’192 Patent, Claim 1)</p> <p>(’864 Patent, Claim 1)</p> <p>(’678 Patent, Claim 45)</p> <p>(’811 Patent, Claims 1, 4, 9, 22, 24)</p> <p>(’579 Patent, Claim 7)</p>	<p>No construction necessary beyond plain meaning</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>’192 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 17, 24, 35, 40, 60</p> <p>Abstract, Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 1:23–2:8, 4:53–7:25, 8:39–62, 9:5–11:48, 12:32–14:40</p> <p>’864 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 20–22, 26, 29, 31, 33, 36, 47</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 21–26, 1:18–2:7, 3:66–6:57, 8:4–11:27, 12:12–18:60, 20:33–23:8</p> <p>’678 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 26, 37, 45</p> <p>Abstract, Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 1:22–2:9, 5:1–7:40, 8:57–12:2, 12:54–15:3</p> <p>’811 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 4, 6–7, 9, 11–13, 15–16, 19–25, 27</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>Abstract, Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 1:23–2:10, 5:1–7:40, 8:57–12:2, 12:54–15:3</p> <p>'579 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 7, 24</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 21–26, 1:20–2:11, 4:9–7:3, 8:22–11:47, 12:32–19:30, 21:3–23:49</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p> <p>Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition (<i>see, e.g.</i>, page 592 definitions for “indicative” and “indicate”)</p> <p>Sandeep Chatterjee and James Webber, <i>Developing Enterprise Web Services An Architect's Guide</i>, 2004 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, page 104)</p> <p>Sandeep Chatterjee et al., <i>Concurrent Event Handling Through Multithreading</i>, 1999 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, page 6)</p> <p>Sandeep Chatterjee and Srinivas Devadas, <i>The MASC Computing Infrastructure for Intelligent Environments</i>, 1999 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, page 5)</p> <p>Declaration of Sandeep Chatterjee, Ph.D. in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,412,486 B1, Case No. IPR2017-01002 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 41–42, 57–58, 69–70, 74, 120, 124)</p> <p>Declaration of Sandeep Chatterjee, Ph.D. in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,301,713 B2, Case No. IPR2019-00899 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, pages 34–38, 50, 80, 83–84, 89, 95–96, 100, 102)</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>Declaration of Sandeep Chatterjee, Ph.D. in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,128,981 B1, Case No. IPR2019-01516 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, page 116)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,798,007 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 3A–3B, 14:4–31:3, Claim 1)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,885,527 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 1:23–2:12, 15:44–16:39, Claims 10, 17)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 10,949,850 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 3, 1:37–2:18, 2:32–3:62, 12:63–13:40, Claim 9)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 11,095,439 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 5–8, 1:56–3:60, 11:62–16:47, 19:63–32:62, Claim 1)</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 11,276,279 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, 3:10–14:53, Claims 1, 6, 7, 15, 16)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2011/0246612 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, [0090], Claims 6, 8, 18, 22)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2018/0287948 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 3A–3B, [0009], [0010], [0011], [0043], [0044], [0047], [0069], [0088], [0089], [0091], [0111], [0112], Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 19)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2021/0295223 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Abstract, Figs. 3–5, [0004], [0017], [0043], [0047], [0049], [0050], [0054], [0067], [0069], [0089], [0094], [0100], Claims 1, 15, 19–20)</p> <p>U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2022/0086181 (<i>see, e.g.</i>, Fig. 2, [0004], [0036], [0044], Claims 1, 11, 20)</p>
<p>“the selected characteristics” (Δ)</p> <p>(’579 Patent, Claim 1)</p>	<p>No construction necessary beyond plain meaning</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>’579 Patent:</p> <p>Claims 1, 3, 7</p> <p>Figs. 1–3, 5–14, 21–26, 1:20–2:11, 4:9–7:3, 8:22–9:41, 10:27–16:67, 18:29–19:30, 21:3–23:49</p> <p>’579 Patent File History:</p> <p>May 16, 2019 Non-Final Rejection</p> <p>November 18, 2019 Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 154, 164, 167, 171, 174), exhibits thereto, and the Court’s Markman order (Dkt. No. 176) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Seattle Spinco, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00469-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p>

Term	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction	Plaintiff's Evidence
		<p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 61, 70, 73, 77, 80), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 82) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00501-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>All claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 60, 69, 72, 76, 79), exhibits thereto, and the Court's Markman order (Dkt. No. 81) from <i>Wapp Tech Limited Partnership and Wapp Tech Corp. v. Bank of America Corp.</i>, No. 4:18-cv-00519-ALM, (E.D. Tex.).</p> <p>The forthcoming Expert Report of Dr. Sam Malek</p>